

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.nspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/937,286	09/25/2001	Muradin Abubekirovich Kumakhov	KUMAKHOV-002	9535		
75	90 03/31/2003					
William H Holt			EXAMINER			
Law Offices Of	Law Offices Of William H Holt			110 111 511 0		
Unit 2 First Floo	r		HO, AL	LENC		
1423 Powhatan	Street					
Alexandria, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2882			
			DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				11/
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	V
Office Action Summary		09/937,286 KUMAKHOV, MURADIN ABUBEKIROVICH		RADIN
	••	Examiner	Art Unit	
	The MAILING DATE of this arms in the	Allen C. Ho	2882	
· ciiou it	• •			dress
- External forms - External forms - If the - If NO - Failur - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLIMALING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replication of the provided period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a re y within the statutory minimum of thirt will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely THS from the mailing date of this co	r. mmunication.
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
2a)⊠		— · is action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowa		toro proposition t- th	
•	closed in accordance with the practice under on of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.[). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	e ments is
4)🖾	Claim(s) 20-38 is/are pending in the application	n.		
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.		
5)🖂	Claim(s) <u>28-30</u> is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>20-27 and 31-38</u> is/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) 🗌	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application	on Papers	·	·	
	The specification is objected to by the Examiner			
10)□ T	he drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accep	ted or b)□ objected to by th	e Examiner.	
_	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11)∐ T	he proposed drawing correction filed on		sapproved by the Examine	r.
🗖 –	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep			
	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa $\cdot\cdot$	aminer.		
	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) 🖾 🛚	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)[∑	☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
•	 Certified copies of the priority documents 	have been received.		
2	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received in Ap	plication No	
	B.⊠ Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bure se the attached detailed Office action for a list o	eau (PCT Rule 17 2(a))		tage
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic			
_ a)	The translation of the foreign language prov	isional application has bee	en received.	ipplication)
بر النازة ا !tachment	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	phonty under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 120 and/or 121.	
Notice	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) U Notice of Inf	mmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ormal Patent Application (PTO-	
Patent and Trad		6)	·	
O-326 (Rev.		on Summary	Part of Pa	per No. 11

Art Unit: 2882

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grodzins et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,696,806).

With regard to claim 20, Grodzins *et al.* disclosed a method for producing the image of the internal structure of an object (3) with x-rays (2), where the object is subjected to x-rays and the output from one or more x-ray detectors (18, 20, 42, 43) is used for obtaining data on the substance density of the object (column 1, lines 26-29); wherein x-rays concentration (36) is done in a zone located within a target area (surface area) of the object and covering the current point (a voxel), to which the measurement results are attributed; the secondary radiation (Compton-scattered radiation) excited in this zone is transported (15, 16, 44, 45) to one or more detectors (18, 20, 42, 43); the target area of the object is scanned by moving the zone (column 3, lines 16-32); judgment on the substance density of an object in the current point is made based on the population of intensity values of the secondary radiation, which are obtained with the help of one or more detectors and which are determined concurrently with coordinates (voxel coordinates, see Fig. 2) of the current point within the x-rays concentration zone, to which the measurement results are attributed; and the above density values are used together with

Art Unit: 2882

respective coordinate values to build up a density distribution picture (three-dimensional tomographic image) for the target area of the object.

With regard to claim 21, Grodzins et al. disclosed a method according to claim 20, wherein the x-rays concentration is done with the help of one or more collimators (36) using a respective number of space-apart x-ray source (33); excited secondary radiation is transported to one or more detectors (18, 20, 42, 43) with the help of one or more collimators (15, 16, 44, 45), and all collimators are oriented so that the axes of their central channels would cross in the current point (voxel), to which the measurement results are attributed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grodzins et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,696,806) as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Yan et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,812,631).

With regard to claim 22-26, Grodzins et al. disclosed a method according to claim 20, wherein the x-rays concentration is done with the help of one or more collimators (36), and excited secondary radiation is transported to one or more detectors (18, 20, 42, 43) with the help of one or more collimators (15, 16, 44, 45).

Art Unit: 2882

However, Grodzins et al. did not teach using various x-ray optics (half lens, collimator with channels, etc.) for focusing, collimating, and collecting x-rays.

Yan et al. disclosed various x-ray optics, including half lens (Fig. 4) and collimator with channels (Figs. 2 and 5), for focusing, collimating, and collecting x-rays.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the collimators with various x-ray optics for focusing and collecting x-rays, since a person would be motivated to choose from among the known equivalents based solely on design choice absent any showing of criticality. The lack of criticality is demonstrated by applicant's claiming of a plurality of equivalent arrangements for focusing, collimating, and collecting x-rays.

5. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grodzins et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,696,806) in view of Vogeley, Jr. (U. S. Patent No. 5,585,603).

With regard to claim 27, Grodzins *et al.* disclosed a device for producing an image of the internal structure of an object (3) with x-rays, comprising: a means (conveyor) for positioning the object under study; an x-ray optical system, wherein the x-ray optical system contains one (1) or more (33) x-ray sources and an x-rays concentration means (36) for concentration of radiation from the one or more x-ray sources in the zone located inside the target area (surface area) of the object and covering the current point (a voxel), to which the measurement results are attributed; a means (column 3, lines 16-32) for relative movement of the means for positioning the object under study versus the x-ray optical system; a means for data processing and imaging (inherent, for generating a tomographic image); one or more means (15, 16, 44, 45) for transportation of excited secondary radiation (Compton scattered radiation) and mounted close to their exit x-rays

Art Unit: 2882

detectors (18, 20, 42, 43) for the secondary radiation, where the output from these detectors is connected to the means for data processing an imaging (inherent).

However, Grodzins et al. did not teach that the means for positioning of the object under study and the x-ray optical system are connected to sensors designed for determining the coordinates of the current point, to which the measurement results are attributed, and those sensors are connected through their outlets to the means for data processing and imaging.

Vogeley, Jr. disclosed a position sensor (18) for determining the coordinates of each pixel of an object under study, the position sensor is connected to a computer (26) for data processing and imaging.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide position sensors for determining the coordinates of the point, since a person would be motivated to associate the output from each detector with a coordinate in order to create a tomographic image.

6. Claims 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grodzins *et al.* (U. S. Patent No. 5,696,806) and Vogeley, Jr. (U. S. Patent No. 5,585,603) as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Yan *et al.* (U. S. Patent No. 5,812,631).

With regard to claims 31-38, Grodzins et al. and Vogeley, Jr. disclosed a device according to claim 27, wherein the x-ray optical system contains one (1) or more (33) x-ray sources and an x-rays concentration means (36) for concentration of radiation from the one or more x-ray sources in the zone located in side the target area (surface area) of the object and covering the current point (a voxel), and one or more means (15, 16, 44, 45) for transportation of

Art Unit: 2882

excited secondary radiation (Compton scattered radiation) and mounted close to their exit x-rays detectors (18, 20, 42, 43) for the secondary radiation.

However, Grodzins et al. did not teach using various x-ray optics (half lens, collimator with channels, etc.) for focusing, collimating, and collecting x-rays.

Yan et al. disclosed various x-ray optics, including half lens (Fig. 4) and collimator with channels (Figs. 2 and 5), for focusing, collimating, and collecting x-rays.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the collimators with various x-ray optics for focusing and collecting x-rays, since a person would be motivated to choose from among the known equivalents based solely on design choice absent any showing of criticality. The lack of criticality is demonstrated by applicant's claiming of a plurality of equivalent arrangements for focusing, collimating, and collecting x-rays.

Allowable Subject Matter

- Claims 28-30 are allowed. 7.
- The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

With regard to claims 28-30, although the prior art discloses devices for producing an image of the internal structure of an object with x-rays comprising an x-ray optical system, wherein the x-ray optical system contains an x-ray source and an x-rays concentration means for concentration of radiation from the x-ray source in the zone located inside the target area (surface area) of the object and covering the current point (a voxel), and one or more means for transportation (collimators) of excited secondary radiation (Compton scattered radiation) and mounted close to their exit x-rays detectors for the secondary radiation, it fails to teach or fairly suggest that the x-ray optical system contains a plurality of x-ray sources, each of the x-rays concentration means designed for concentration of radiation from the sources, each of the means for transportation of the secondary radiation excited in the zone to detectors, having its channels oriented towards to above x-ray concentration zone, and the optical axes of the central channels of all collimators cross in the current point, to which the measurement results are attributed.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

- 9. The examiner agrees with the applicant that Onoguchi *et al.* failed to teach or fairly suggest a method and a device for obtaining the distribution of the density of an object. The rejections based on Onoguchi *et al.* are withdrawn.
- 10. Applicant's arguments with respect to rejections based on Grodzins *et al.* fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Page 8

Application/Control Number: 09/937,286

Art Unit: 2882

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen C. Ho whose telephone number is (703) 308-6189. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached at (703) 305-3492. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0530.

Allen C. Ho Examiner Art Unit 2882

ACH March 24, 2003

